



Corres. and Mail
BOX AF

AF

61.
**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP 2826
PATENT APPLICATION**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q64129

Seiji UMEMOTO, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/835,316

Group Art Unit: 2826

Confirmation No.: 5326

Examiner: Fazli ERDEM

Filed: April 17, 2001

For: TOUCH TYPE LIQUID-CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE AND INPUT DETECTING
METHOD

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated July 30, 2003, reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Request, claims 1-15 are pending in the application. In response to the Office Action (Paper No. 8), Applicant respectfully submits the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,483,498; hereafter “Colgan”) in view of Kurihara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,501,529; hereafter “Kurihara”), Akimoto et al. (JP 3-11514; hereafter “Akimoto”), Kubo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,337; hereafter “Kubo”) and Inou (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,107). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

RECEIVED
NOV - 3 2003
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/835,316

Colgan in view of Kurihara, Akimoto, Kubo, Inou, and Okuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,280; hereafter “Okuda”). Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan in view of Kurihara, Akimoto, Kubo, Inou and Takatori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,592; hereafter “Takatori”). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan in view of Kurihara, Akimoto, Kubo, Inou and Yamagata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,024; hereafter Yamagata). Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.¹

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention would not have been rendered obvious in view of the combined references. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that it is quite clear that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “a touch panel disposed on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of said liquid-crystal display panel”, as recited in independent claim 1, and “disposing a touch panel comprising at least a pair of electrodes opposite to each other through a gap on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of a liquid-crystal display panel” as recited in independent claim 15.

The rejections of independent claims 1 and 15 are essentially the same as in the previous Office Action dated February 3, 2003 except the Examiner has replaced the previously cited Sato patent with the Kubo patent (which the Examiner relies for “a touch panel where the required electrode structure is disclose[d]”). However, the Examiner did not expressly respond to Applicant’s arguments for patentability set forth in the Amendment filed May 5, 2003.

¹ Although the Office Action Summary indicates that claim 3 is rejected and claim 15 is objected to, the detailed rejections on pages 2-5 of the Office Action indicate that claim 15 is rejected (page 5) while claim 3 is included in the rejections.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/835,316

As in the previous Office Action, the Examiner asserts Colgan discloses all of the features of the claimed invention except for a touch panel disposed on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of a liquid-crystal display panel, which the Examiner asserts is disclosed by Kurihara and Akimoto. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Kurihara discloses “a liquid crystal display element integrated with a touch sensor where the touch sensor is on the opposite side of the LCD panel.” However, Kurihara simply discloses that opposing pairs of LCD electrodes (15, 18) and opposing pairs of touch electrodes (16, 19) are alternately disposed along side each other on a first substrate and a second substrate such that LCD panel and touch panel are integrated together (see Figures 3 and 4). Thus, the touch sensor is not on the opposite side of the LCD panel as the Examiner contends.

The Examiner again incorrectly asserts that Akimoto discloses “touch panels on both sides of the LCD panel.” However, Figure 1 of Akimoto discloses a color tone correcting liquid crystal panel 22 having a pair of touch switch electrodes 33 disposed on a visual side of a character display liquid crystal panel 21. Figure 2 of Akimoto discloses a touch switch panel 42 provided on the visual side separately from the liquid crystal display panel 41. In the display device shown in Figure 3, a touch switch panel is provided integrally in the liquid crystal display panel 1. Lastly, in the display device shown in Figure 4, a color tone correcting liquid crystal panel 10 are provided on the visual side of (and separately from) the liquid crystal display panel 9 (note Fig. 4 in Akimoto illustrates a prior art display device without a touch switch panel).

Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits that it is quite clear Inou, Okuda, Takatori and Yamagata do not teach or suggest the features of claimed invention (i.e., a touch panel disposed

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/835,316

on a back side, opposite to a visual side, of a liquid-crystal display panel) which are missing from Akimoto.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 15, as well as dependent claims 2-14, should be allowable because the applied references, alone or combined, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 30, 2003

Attorney Docket No.: Q64129